UNITED NATIONS

DP

Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme

Distr.
GENERAL

DP/1993/66
28 April 1993

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

Fortieth session
1-18 June 1993, New York
Item 4 of the provisional agenda

PROGRAMME PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTATION

Synthesis of the findings and recommendations contained in the reports on field visits of the Standing Committee for Programme Matters in 1992

Report of the Bureau of the Governing Council

CONTENTS

	Paragraphs	Page
Introduction	1 - 4	3
I. ORGANIZATIONAL ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE MISSIONS	5 - 12	4
A. Terms of reference, lengths of visits, composition of teams, briefings and itineraries	5 - 10	4
B. Work programme	11	5
C. Reporting formats	12	5
II. GENERAL ISSUES	13 - 40	5
A. Programme approach, including country programming	13 - 17	5
B. Comparative advantage, including impact of the system	18	6
C. Coordination	19 - 23	7
D. National capacity building, including national execution	24 - 29	8

93-27272 (E) 240593

250593

/...

CONTENTS (continued)

		Paragraphs	Page
	E. Decentralization	30 - 31	9
	F. Agency support costs	32	10
	G. Headquarters/field office communications	33 - 36	10
	H. Office for Project Services (OPS)	37 - 38	11
	I. National Technical Cooperation Assessment and Programmes (NATCAPs)	39 - 40	11
III.	SPECIFIC ISSUES	41 - 52	11
	A. Private sector in development	41	11
	B. Women in Development (WID)	42	12
	C. Technical Cooperation among Developing Countries (TCDC)	43 - 45	12
	D. United Nations Volunteers (UNV)	46 - 47	12
	E. HIV/AIDS	48 - 49	13
	F. Others	50 - 52	13
IV.	ADMINISTRATIVE AND HUMAN RESOURCES ISSUES	53 - 59	14
	A. Field office staffing: international, junior professional of officers (JPOs), national officers, local administrative personnel	53 - 57	14
	B. Common premises	58 - 59	14
V.	UNFPA - SPECIFIC ISSUES	60 - 63	14

Annexes

I.	GOVERNING COUNCIL DECISION 91/2 OF 22 FEBRUARY 1991: STANDING COMMITTEE FOR PROGRAMME MATTERS	16
II.	TERMS OF REFERENCE: FIELD VISITS (UNDP/UNFPA)	20
III.	LIST OF PARTICIPANTS	22

Introduction

1. Decision 91/2 of the Governing Council, adopted at its organizational session in February 1991, made provision for up to four field visits per year to be undertaken by members of the Standing Committee on Programme Matters (SCPM) "for information purposes". Each mission was to cover not more than two countries and comprise an average of six participants, whose composition would take into account the equitable membership of the Council. The costs would be shared between UNDP and UNFPA in the proportion of 80 per cent and 20 per cent, respectively. In its decision the Council invited all donor countries, as well as other countries in a position to do so, to pay for their own participation. In the same decision, participants were invited to participate actively in the preparation of the visits and in the work of the Committee during the presentation of its findings. A copy of the decision is contained in annex I.

2. At its in-sessional meeting in February 1992, the Standing Committee, on the basis of experience gained through the fielding of the first three visits to a total of six countries (Botswana/United Republic of Tanzania, Indonesia/Sri Lanka, and Egypt/Morocco), prepared standard terms of reference to facilitate the planning of future visits. A copy of the terms of reference is contained in annex II. These were used in the preparations for the next three visits: one to India/Bhutan in March; and the others to Syria/Yemen and Bolivia/Paraguay, both in September 1992. Reports on all visits were presented to the Standing Committee at its in-sessional meetings following each such visit. Annex III contains a list of participants, countries visited, and dates of presentation of reports.

3. At its in-sessional meeting in February 1993, the Standing Committee, after taking note of the reports of the two field visits to the Syrian Arab Republic/Yemen and Bolivia/Paraguay, which had taken place in September 1992, requested the Bureau to provide a synthesis of the findings and recommendations of all reports of field visits accomplished thus far, to be reviewed at its in-sessional meeting during the fortieth session of the Governing Council. The Bureau is submitting the synthesis to the Standing Committee for consideration at its present session. The Standing Committee may wish to review the terms of reference of the field visits in the light of the experience that has been gained since the adoption of the current terms of reference in February 1992.

4. In preparing this report, the Bureau has summarized findings and recommendations on issues that were common to all, or several, reports. Views are also presented that were found to be at variance with the otherwise collective positions. An attempt has been made as well to record findings of recommendations of any one report that, in the Bureau's view, would have common application or wider interest.

I. ORGANIZATIONAL ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE MISSIONS

A. Terms of reference, lengths of visits, composition of teams, briefings and itineraries

5. Participants of the first three missions (to the United Republic of Tanzania/Botswana, Sri Lanka/Indonesia, and Egypt/Morocco) expressed the need for having standard terms of reference to facilitate the preparation of appropriately focused programmes for future field visits. The terms of reference developed by SCPM at its February 1992 meeting, and used in the preparation of the next three missions (to India/Bhutan, Syria/Yemen, and Bolivia/Paraguay) were found to be appropriate and proved useful for the purpose.

6. The opportunity of amending or fine-tuning the programmes of visits as proposed by the Resident Representative (based upon the standard terms of reference) was generally welcomed. It was suggested, however, that the proposed programme should be made available to participants two weeks in advance of the commencement of a mission to enable the field office to incorporate any suggested changes in good time.

7. The participation of a UNDP headquarters representative, particularly one with experience as a Resident Representative, had been found to be especially useful in clarifying issues and improving the team's understanding of the United Nations context. On the other hand, opinions varied as regards the presence of headquarters or local UNDP representatives in certain meetings with government officials and national project authorities. While some teams felt that the absence would have helped in better understanding concerns and expectations, one team indicated that in its experience this did not produce any change of atmosphere, nor of issues brought up.

8. All reports indicate that the missions were well organized and the field trips, especially project visits, were found to be relevant. One report drew attention to the need of having project managers adequately briefed on the purpose of the visit to avoid lengthy technical presentations and allowing, instead, the mission to focus on the role and comparative advantage of UNDP/UNFPA involvement in the specific projects.

9. The mission to the United Republic of Tanzania of 10 days duration was found to be lengthy for the purpose. Members of other missions found their average of five days work in one country not long enough to obtain a comprehensive understanding of the UNDP/UNFPA programme, but extremely useful in understanding the context of the country and some salient features of UNDP/UNFPA activity focused for their observation. In this context, it was acknowledged that the period of two weeks was about the maximum that most participants could be expected to devote to these field visits in view of their busy schedules.

10. Most reports advocated keeping courtesy calls to an absolute minimum because of time constraints. The need for maintaining an equitable gender balance in the composition of the team was also indicated. One team reported that the interpretation facility had been most helpful for those of its members who were not familiar with the working language of the country visited.

B. Work programme

11. There was general recognition of a marked improvement in the focus and contents of the teams' programmes of work since the adoption by SCPM of the standard terms of reference for the field visits. In view of time constraints, however, it was noted that the number of projects to be visited in each country may have to remain limited. To facilitate a meaningful dialogue with project personnel, it was suggested in one report that field offices should provide the team members sufficient advance background information on the projects selected including sectoral setting, project objectives, volume of total (and UNDP/UNFPA) funding, execution modality, implementing agency, etc. Within the programme, sufficient time should be allowed for meeting with UNDP/UNFPA/Agency personnel, and representatives of the World Bank, bilateral donors, regional development banks and NGOs. Time should also be provided for drafting the report.

C. Reporting formats

12. To foster uniformity and consistency in the scope and contents of mission reports, the conclusions of several reports called for the adoption by SCPM of a standard structure, or outline for the preparation of reports of future field visits. The structure of this synthesis document may provide the guidelines for the reporting formats for future field visits.

II. GENERAL ISSUES

A. Programme approach, including country programming

13. Most reports shared the view that while interest in the programme approach (as a shift from the past practice of scatterization of projects) was gradually awakening, a proper understanding of the concept, and of its implications, both in Governments and in UNDP field offices, was yet not clear. The same appeared to be true of the six priority areas identified by the Governing Council for UNDP's support to national capacity-building efforts in the fifth cycle. In such countries as Egypt and the Syrian Arab Republic, where the programme approach is being utilized to enhance the effective use and sustainability of UNDP cooperation, the degree of enthusiasm for it has appeared to vary from ministry to ministry, from those that have understood it well, and accepted the responsibility to apply it, to those that are showing resistance to the new concept that would move them away from micro-management.

14. The recurrent findings of the reports reveal that two factors appear to be among the principal causes of this phenomenon: first, the structure of, and interrelationships within, the United Nations system; and second, the somewhat uncoordinated framework of the Governments' dealings with organizations of the system at the country level. In so far as the United Nations system is concerned, fundamental changes would be required that would direct funding and other assistance to a coordinated programme rather than keeping open the avenues of seeking sporadic funding for individual projects stemming from separate agendas. These changes would allow UNDP, in coordination with other organizations of the United Nations system, to play its role as a central development agency, with limited resources, to assist Governments, at their

requests, in the preparation of sectoral, multi-sectoral or sub-sectoral strategies and, where required, in building or strengthening their capacity to coordinate all external assistance at the national level.

15. As one report stresses, the availability of a national development plan, and the Government's preparedness to discuss national programmes with UNDP appear also to be of fundamental importance for the fuller realization of the programme approach concept. Another report visualizes a great deal of work ahead for the Governing Council to define more clearly the concept of a programme approach and the fifth cycle thematic areas; and for the UNDP Administration to take steps to enhance understanding of the concept, and to put in place appropriate modalities to implement that concept.

16. The reports on the visits to Bolivia and Paraguay reflect a comparatively better understanding of the programme approach, and of its incorporation into the two fifth cycle country programmes, with the advocated priority areas being used as flexible tools to achieve specific objectives. This appeared, partly, to be the result of a conscious government effort to achieve a manageable programme, putting order in the flow of technical cooperation, and channelling assistance from several sources towards commonly accepted goals; and, perhaps, partly due to the fact that by the time of the SCPM's field visit comparatively more time had been available for the introduction of UNDP guidelines on the programme approach.

17. Citing the Bolivia country programme as a good example of the implementation of the policies enunciated in General Assembly resolution 44/211, the report recommends that it should serve as a prototype for the operational activities of the United Nations system elsewhere, and a training ground for staff of other UNDP field offices. A similar recommendation appears for the UNDP office in Paraguay.

B. Comparative advantage, including impact of the system

18. Several reports reflect commonality in the perception of UNDP's comparative advantages: neutrality in such sensitive issues as public service reforms; catalyst in developing new and innovative programmes; and speed of response in providing expertise on urgent issues. Others perceive the comparative advantages of UNDP in areas peculiar to their own needs: simpler procurement procedures; availability of foreign currency for import of equipment; facilitator to gain access to technical resources world wide, and to regional and global networks especially in high-technology areas; familiarity with the country because of its presence since 1972 (Bhutan). In both Bolivia and Paraguay, the report reveals that UNDP and UNFPA are regarded by the Governments as more sympathetic, flexible and effective agents as compared with the Bretton Woods institutions. The Governments of the United Republic of Tanzania, Sri Lanka and Indonesia reportedly saw advantage in reserving portions of their country programmes for quality gap-filling, or for unforeseen needs.

C. Coordination

19. With the exception of the reports on the field visits to Bhutan, Paraguay and the Syrian Arab Republic, the findings of all others reveal weaknesses in the local coordination mechanisms within the United Nations system. Among the principal reasons cited are the problems emanating from conflicting instructions from different agencies headquarters to their field representatives; separate representations by many agencies which produce institutional differences ranging from administrative procedures to diverse programme and budget cycles; weak coordination arrangements in the Government itself; and uncoordinated lobbying by agencies for projects.

20. The reports on the visits to Bhutan and the Syrian Arab Republic seem to indicate that the Governments' effective coordination practices, coupled with the tactful leadership role exercised by the Resident Coordinators, have gone a long way in providing better coordination within the system. The report on the visit to Paraguay, on the other hand, adds that the Resident Coordinator's unified representation of many other agencies (which do not have separate representatives in the country) has made the task easier. The report on the visit to Bhutan states that the small community has made the task of coordination less complex and success is manifested in the synchronized programming cycles which now apply to all but one of the agencies (the World Health Organization). The common view prevailing appears to be that of the need to harmonize programme cycles and to unify administrative procedures under the programme approach concept. This should contribute towards the attainment of more effective coordination within the United Nations system at the field level.

21. The report on the visit to Bolivia and Paraguay further remarks that problems in the field many times reflect a lack of coordination among agency headquarters and among governing bodies. Many times the work of field representatives is thwarted by inflexible directives from headquarters. Such comments as "the (governing body) does not allow it" are not uncommon.

22. The report goes on to say, "Nevertheless, coordination requires even greater effort. Whilst good will between individuals is important, there should be a more formal structure to permit continuity of coordination when personnel change. In this context, the idea of a single [United Nations] Coordinator with greater authority and the necessary means should be considered."

23. The few reports that have commented on coordination with bilateral donors referred mainly to the informal nature of the current effort, although the potentials for this role were recognized. The only exception is the report on the visit to Morocco in which UNFPA has been commended for successful coordination with bilateral donors. Here again it is stated that UNFPA's coordination efforts with other United Nations agencies there have been frustrating. The team visiting Indonesia found that UNDP could play a greater role, serving as catalyst while projecting a focused image of the efforts within the donor community. The report on the visit to the United Republic of Tanzania, noting the monthly donor meetings co-chaired by UNDP and the World Bank, which mostly dealt with administrative matters, found the situation complicated by the weak coordination capacity of the Government. It stated that UNDP will have to play a very active role to help improve the situation.

D. National capacity building, including national execution

24. In several reports the question of national capacity building is reflected in the treatment of the issue of national execution, while in others the examination of the use of the programme approach in country programming highlights the raison d'être of that exercise, i.e. support to national capacity-building efforts. The common view is that while with past UNDP/UNFPA cooperation significant transfers of technology have taken place, support to the process of national capacity building has been slow partly because of the nature of the United Nations system's involvement in the programmes and projects, and partly because of the tendency in the Governments to continue to rely on the United Nations specialized agencies to maintain their traditional form of support.

25. On the other hand, as the reports on the visits to Egypt, Bolivia and Paraguay reveal, a strong government commitment to self-reliant national capacity building tends to introduce changes in the nature of the relationships with organizations of the United Nations development system by transforming them from a role of supporting ongoing sectoral activities, and introducing new ones under indicative planning figure (IPF) and other forms of funding, to assisting in the creation or strengthening of national capacity to plan, strategize, execute, implement, and monitor the implementation of national development plans, programmes and projects. In this scenario, plans and strategies are developed, programmes are formulated and projects are executed by national personnel, serving with national institutions under national supervision and guidance, with such technical advice and support from the United Nations system as deemed necessary.

26. National execution plays an important, if not the central, role in this process. The role of the United Nations system is to assist Governments in building or, where needed, strengthening the capacity of national institutions to assume the management and execution of all programme activities. The reports on the visits to Bolivia and Paraguay indicate clear government commitment to building and strengthening national capacity for programme and project execution, and to directing UNDP cooperation through the respective fifth cycle country programmes towards the fulfilment of this objective.

27. Reports on other field visits indicate a continuing lack of clarity over the definition of national execution which is often confused with "implementation" and "management". In India, for instance, the team reported hearing of almost one third of the combined UNDP/UNFPA programmes under national execution, yet noticing a lack of clarity on the concept. Different teams have reported similar confusion in other field offices and in Governments. The report on the visit to Morocco goes on to say that the main obstacle to national execution is not only the all-encompassing role played by the multitude of donors at the project level, but also often the specialized agencies' reported reluctance to provide technical assistance to nationally executed projects. One possible reason for the reported confusion might have been the fact that both UNDP/UNFPA field offices, and recipient governmental institutions, needed time to familiarize and operationalize the new guidelines which had been received only shortly before most of the field visits of 1992 were undertaken.

28. Three other common factors affecting national execution, reported by the teams, were, first, the complex financial reporting and other procedural requirements which have often necessitated the UNDP office spending considerable time training national officials on rules and procedures; second, the limited technical and administrative capacities in the least developed countries (LDCs) and some other developing countries under special constraints where national institutions are either lacking, or not yet ready to undertake project execution responsibilities; and, third existing regulatory and procedural constraints in some Governments in recruiting and making payments to international experts, in placing fellows and organizing study tours abroad, and in undertaking international procurements.

29. To cope with these and other constraints, the teams' recommendations called for the following actions: further conceptual work by both the Governing Council, and UNDP/UNFPA administrations in defining national execution and distinguishing it from "project implementation" and "project management"; encouragement by the United Nations system of recipient countries to assume not only the administrative and operational support functions but full responsibility for the management of all development programmes assisted by the United Nations system, together with full accountability for the effective use of all external resources; where national capacities are lacking, or insufficient, UNDP and UNFPA, together with the Governments concerned, should move gradually and cautiously with the implementation of the national execution modality; concerted efforts by the organizations of the United Nations system to unify or harmonize their rules and procedures concerning support to national execution; efforts by recipient Governments, where necessary with support from the United Nations system, in changing internal rules and procedures to facilitate the assumption of national execution responsibilities with accountability obligations; and strengthening of UNDP/UNFPA field offices to enable them to assist national agencies, especially in LDCs, to gain the required know-how to carry out financial accounting of nationally executed projects.

E. Decentralization

30. The question of decentralization was observed at two different levels: field office administration, including local personnel issues; and programming activity including programme and project administration. In so far as the decentralization process in the field office administration was concerned, the teams found general satisfaction with the way this has been carried out. At the same time, there appeared to be scope for further decentralization in programming activity.

31. The team visiting India and Bhutan noted the feeling in both offices that the tendency at headquarters to micro-manage, without having the necessary capacity to process programme and project proposals, results in avoidable delays. The mission to Bolivia/Paraguay brought back a similar impression that greater decision-making could be left to the Resident Representatives without loss of control, particularly when considering that comprehensive methods for accountability already exist. It recommended that the Governing Council should consider calling for more decentralization, including greater delegation of financial approval authority to the field for both UNDP and UNFPA.

F. Agency support costs

32. The reports conclude that from the point of view of resident representatives the successor arrangements, when fully operational, would be helpful in strengthening their coordinating roles, in fostering national execution and in promoting healthy competition among implementing agencies. But these and other positive effects appeared to be some way off since the teams noted that the arrangements had yet to be fully understood by the specialized agencies, the recipient Governments and even UNDP field offices. Some of the field offices visited (Botswana, the United Republic of Tanzania, India, Bhutan, the Syrian Arab Republic and Yemen) were familiarizing their staffs with the mechanisms of the support cost arrangements and were finding the process somewhat complex. It was felt that the implementation of these arrangements would involve a considerable orientation and training effort. The report of the field visit to Morocco appears to sum up the collective feelings of the missions in recommending that the Governing Council, in cooperation with the governing bodies and secretariats of the technical agencies, must try to ensure that the new support cost arrangements are fully understood.

G. Headquarters/field office communications

33. The state of communication within the field offices, and with project personnel, and in several instances between field offices and headquarters bureaux and other units is, with an odd exception, reported generally to be sound, timely and open. Contrasting this are the findings of the reports on the flow of information and directives from the legislative bodies to the field, and feedback from the field.

34. General Assembly and Economic and Social Council resolutions, and Governing Council decisions appeared sometimes to be ambiguous, even contradictory (e.g. on national execution) at the field level. Moreover, it was found that a lack of clear definition of terms has made the implementation of some of these resolutions and decisions difficult, even resulting in misinterpretation of particular ones (e.g. Governing Council decisions on Special Programme Resources). Some decisions do not always seem to be aiming at accountability.

35. Conversely, some missions noted that a feedback on the operational impact of particular Governing Council decisions has not normally reached the Council in a timely manner. A case in point, cited in the report on the mission to Morocco, was that of the project managers' inability to hire national consultants at international rates (failing which they were not easily available, being scarce and highly in demand). With some flexibility in the decision from the Governing Council on this issue, the project managers informed the visiting team that the task of project implementation could be greatly facilitated, without incurring expenditure in international travel, subsistence, etc.

36. The common conclusion of the teams was that the Governing Council should develop a better mechanism for assessing the real impact of its decisions and systematically monitor their cost/benefit implications, particularly when such review may improve the work of the system as a whole.

H. Office for Project Services (OPS)

37. With the exception of the report on the field visit to Yemen, the reports carry positive impressions of the work of OPS in the field. Both in the Syrian Arab Republic and Bolivia, for instance, OPS activities are reported to be viewed with favour and were, in fact, on the increase. In the Syrian Arab Republic, OPS procurement facilities were noted to be in demand and were being utilized even for the purchase of equipment from government funds. Its management services were also being utilized in projects being financed from trust funds. In Yemen, on the other hand, experience is reported to have been different with implementation delays of one to three years, resulting in undue cost increases in equipment purchases.

38. The report on the field visit to Bolivia, while acknowledging the useful and effective work of OPS, has raised the point that "at the moment OPS has no clear mandate and is operating autonomously". It goes on to say that there is a need to regularize the role of OPS and to set proper parameters. The report reveals the mission's finding that in Bolivia nearly 50 per cent of UNDP's administrative costs were relating to OPS, whereas it had only a 10 per cent share of the country programme. It recommends that OPS should reimburse UNDP the cost of all services the latter provides to it in the field.

I. National Technical Cooperation Assessment and Programmes (NATCAPs)

39. The report on the field visit to the United Republic of Tanzania and Botswana, commenting on the state of NATCAP exercises in both countries, has noted the contrast in the levels of progress of the effort. In the United Republic of Tanzania, since the adoption of General Assembly resolution 44/211, the UNDP field office and the Government have collaborated in the preparation of a draft Technical Cooperation Policy Framework Paper which, in January 1992, awaited cabinet approval. Once adopted, it was expected that its utilization would have positive effect towards enhanced institution-building and a more coherent approach to the coordination of technical cooperation from all sources.

40. On the other hand, in Botswana the preparatory activity had some way to go. The team noted that the UNDP office was encouraging a constructive dialogue with the Government on this issue.

III. SPECIFIC ISSUES

A. Private sector in development

41. The common impression reflected in the findings of the reports is that while in most instances the bulk of support to this sector is being provided by other donors, UNDP's neutrality, catalytic effect, and access to all types of expertise, give it a useful role. Different teams reported varying degrees of UNDP involvement in supporting private sector development, ranging from the placement of a private sector adviser in India, and training of Indian managers through seminars, to a dialogue with the Government of Syria on the role UNDP

could have in providing policy guidance, and in drafting industrial laws and regulations, concerning the development of the country's private sector.

B. Women in Development (WID)

42. The report on the field visit to India and Bhutan briefly comments on the nature of UNDP support to WID activity in both countries. It attaches importance to the advocacy role on gender issues being pursued by a WID unit in the UNDP office in New Delhi, and to the unit's collaboration with national institutions and local NGOs in creating awareness among women, and in organizing women's cooperatives. Similarly, in Bhutan, where the report points to the need for improvement in women's situation in the areas of education and employment, it refers to UNDP's support to a campaign of the Bhutanese authorities aimed at increasing women's awareness and encouraging them in pursuing income-generating activities.

C. Technical Cooperation among Developing Countries (TCDC)

43. The common view prevailing among the reports is that, despite the great use that could be made of TCDC modalities in project planning, there remains a lack of understanding in the field offices of what constitutes TCDC. For instance, the report on the field visit to the United Republic of Tanzania points out that TCDC seems to have been confused with the practice of training Tanzanians in other developing countries (presumably under United Nations system agencies' execution). The cost advantage, that could have been gained if TCDC modalities were used in such arrangements, has thus been lost. (Under TCDC methods, costs would have been shared between the two cooperating countries with some supplementary support added from the IPF of one or both countries). The report indicates that a number of projects recently completed, or currently in progress, could have benefited from the use of TCDC methods thereby reducing total costs.

44. Similarly the report on the visits to India and Bhutan, citing external and internal constraints, concludes that in both countries much work remains to be done in this field with the support of UNDP.

45. The report on the visit to Indonesia states that the team members were particularly impressed with the UNFPA-supported TCDC activities in which Indonesia's innovative approaches to family planning were being shared with other developing countries. The report recommended that in view of the particular advantages to be derived from the use of this modality, special efforts should be made by UNFPA to support requests for its support.

D. United Nations Volunteers (UNV)

46. Reference to UNV is made in the report of the field visits to India and Bhutan. In India, despite UNV Domestic Development Services' (DDS) coverage of a wide range of diversified community-based activities, the report points out that the dimension of the country and the size of its population make the UNV role less visible and somewhat marginal.

47. The field visit to Bhutan, on the other hand, reports a different picture where UNV involvement (with 73 volunteers) in the social and economic development of the country is not only regarded as important, but also critical. However, the mission noted that because of IPF constraints, the Government intends to limit the number of volunteers and to utilize their services more to train national counterparts.

E. HIV/AIDS

48. Reports on the field visits to three countries - the United Republic of Tanzania, India and Bhutan - include references to UNDP's support to HIV/AIDS control activities. While in Bhutan there was, at the time of the visit, no UNDP activity in this area, for both India and the United Republic of Tanzania some impressions were recorded. Although in India the need for creating awareness was emphasized by the fact that many health workers in basic health units were reported to be unaware of the disease, the UNDP country programme had only one AIDS-related project. At the regional level, however, a project based in New Delhi, is covering 15 countries and an AIDS Conference was scheduled for November 1992.

49. In the United Republic of Tanzania, the mission reported that UNDP appeared to lack a coherent policy to translate into field activities. The nature of a cooperative mechanism between UNDP and WHO/GPA (Global Programme on AIDS) also appeared to be unclear. The team's report states, "It seems particularly urgent that this cooperation be improved in the United Republic of Tanzania where the spread of [the] HIV virus is reaching threatening levels."

F. Others

50. Other specific issues, touched upon in the reports, are sustainable development, human resource development, and transfers of technology.

51. The reports on the visits to Bolivia, India, Egypt, the Syrian Arab Republic and Yemen indicate that support to sustainable development, focusing especially on environmental issues, is among the main areas of concentration of their respective UNDP country programmes. Likewise, human resources development also is given priority concentration in India's country programme with almost half of the resources being devoted to activities in this sector. One of the themes of Egypt's programme focuses on human resources management, spearheaded by plans for the establishment of a "think tank" to design a National Human Resources Strategy. The first combined country programme following the merger of the two former Yemens also includes human development among its areas of concentration.

52. On the question of support to transfers of technology, the report on the field visit to India explains that UNDP assistance is being targeted for sectors where even a limited technology transfer from abroad can have a high multiplier effect. The conclusion appears to be an emerging recognition of the effectiveness of UNDP's support to national development efforts in these specific areas.

IV. ADMINISTRATIVE AND HUMAN RESOURCES ISSUES

A. Field office staffing: international, junior professional officers (JPOs), national officers, local administrative personnel

53. In the report on the field visit to Bolivia and Paraguay, participants found the staff of very high standard and professionalism at all levels, and committed to their worthy cause.

54. To help provide a better and more international perspective to the national programme officers (NPOs), the team recommended better on-the-job training outside the country of assignment, either at a regional location, or attachment to other field offices. Similar training was recommended for junior professional officers (JPOs).

55. The team also recommended appropriate recognition of administrative personnel for their contribution to the efforts of the system.

56. The team reports that at a meeting with the Association of local UNDP/UNFPA personnel in Paraguay a number of issues were raised: the need for training; more office space; better installation; and opportunities for working mothers to breast-feed their infants.

57. The team recommended that the budget and staffing of UNDP field offices should reflect the true level of resources managed, not just the IPF.

B. Common premises

58. Two reports, one of the field visit to the United Republic of Tanzania/Botswana, the other to Bolivia/Paraguay, include the question of common premises. In the United Republic of Tanzania, where UNDP, UNFPA, the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) and the World Food Programme (WFP) share common premises, it was found difficult to assemble the rest of the somewhat larger group of United Nations system agencies in one building at this time. In Botswana where UNDP, UNFPA, WFP and UNIDO (represented by a JPO) share the same premises, the team noted that the Government's offer of a plot of land for the construction of common premises was, inexplicably, not taken.

59. A somewhat similar experience was noted by the team in Bolivia where local enthusiasm was reportedly marred by one agency headquarters' pronouncement of inadequacy of space in a building which all agencies' offices had found suitable and agreed to occupy. In Paraguay, the proposition of common premises was being enthusiastically considered, and an offer was, in fact, in the process of being evaluated.

V. UNFPA - SPECIFIC ISSUES

60. While much of what has been summarized in the preceding paragraphs applies both to UNDP and UNFPA, it may be noted that UNFPA's comparative advantages, exemplified by its professional and flexible role in assisting in donor

coordination, training, and policy strategy development, was especially brought to the team's attention in several field offices. It was noted, however, that the capacities of Governments to coordinate population activities effectively both within their own administrations, and among donors, needed further strengthening. The team's recommendations, therefore, called for intensified efforts by UNFPA, in cooperation with UNDP, and UNICEF, towards strengthening governments' policy formulation and coordination capacities in population related activities.

61. On another front, the report of the field visit to Indonesia, while acknowledging UNFPA's long and successful history of cooperation with the country's population programme, suggested that to prevent erosion of credibility repeated revisions of resource allocations to each UNFPA country programme should be avoided by projecting programme resources at more realistic levels.

62. The report on the visit to India indicated that in relation to the size and complexity of the country's population UNFPA's role, though marginal in financial terms, is perceived by the Government as important and instrumental in many aspects. There is room for strengthening its advocacy role, especially at the national level.

63. Finally, the Bhutan report speaks of evidence of close collaboration between UNFPA and UNICEF, and acknowledges that they have synchronized their programme cycles with the Five-Year Development Plan of the Government thus enhancing coordination and relevance of their activities.

Annex I

GOVERNING COUNCIL DECISION 91/2 OF 22 FEBRUARY 1991: STANDING COMMITTEE FOR PROGRAMME MATTERS

A

The Governing Council,

Recalling its decisions 83/5 of 24 June 1983, 85/17 of 29 June 1985, 87/20 of 19 June 1987 and 90/23 of 23 June 1990,

Having considered the report of the Administrator on the Standing Committee for Programme Matters (DP/1991/4),

Taking into account the views expressed by delegations during the discussion of the subject, both at the plenary meetings of the Governing Council and during informal consultations,

Mandate

1. Decides that the Standing Committee for Programme Matters shall, with respect to the United Nations Development Programme, including its special funds and programmes, the United Nations Population Fund, as well as to United Nations technical cooperation activities within the mandate of the Governing Council:

(a) Consider major issues related to programme matters;

(b) Review country, regional, interregional and global programmes and projects;

(c) Review programme and project implementation;

(d) Consider reports on evaluation studies; and

(e) Deal with other matters relating to programme management;

Membership

2. Decides that the membership of the Standing Committee for Programme Matters shall be composed of all members of the Governing Council and that deliberations of the Committee shall be open to all participants in the Programme;

Bureau

3. Decides that the meetings of the Standing Committee for Programme Matters shall be chaired by the President of the Governing Council or by another member of the Bureau designated by the President;

Procedures, including drafting of decisions and reporting

4. Decides that the Standing Committee for Programme Matters shall work within the framework of procedures of the Governing Council, in a similar manner to the Budgetary and Finance Committee, taking into account, inter alia, the latter's practice with respect to the organization of work, the preparation of decisions, as well as the reporting of the plenary meetings of the Council;

Agenda and programme of work

5. Decides that the Standing Committee for Programme Matters shall, at its first meeting each year, determine, according to its mandate, its agenda and programme of work for the year, taking into account any matters referred to it by the Governing Council;

6. Further decides that the Standing Committee for Programme Matters shall have in-sessional meetings twice a year in connection with the organizational meeting and the regular session of the Governing Council; that every effort shall be made to ensure that the Committee's sessional meetings do not coincide with the plenary meetings of the Council; and that a maximum of two inter-sessional meetings per year may be scheduled, as required by the workload of the Committee;

Field visits

7. Decides that, for information purposes, the Standing Committee for Programme Matters, in accordance with its mandate and programme of work, shall request the Administrator of the United Nations Development Programme and the Executive Director of the United Nations Population Fund to arrange and service up to four field visits per year, each for an average of six members of the Governing Council;

8. Decides that the specific programme aspects to be looked into during the field visits shall be determined by the Standing Committee for Programme Matters;

9. Decides that the Standing Committee for Programme Matters, in selecting the participants for these field visits, shall take into account the equitable representation of the membership of the Governing Council and shall invite the participants to participate actively in the preparation of the visits and in the work of the Committee during the presentation of the findings of the field visits;

10. Decides that the selection of countries to be visited (no more than two per field visit) and the timing of the visits shall be determined in consultation with the Administrator of the United Nations Development Programme, the Executive Director of the United Nations Population Fund and the countries concerned;

11. Decides that the findings of the field visits shall be reported by the participants to the Standing Committee for Programme Matters at its subsequent meeting;

Financial arrangements

12. Decides that, in respect of low-income Governing Council member countries (with a per capita 1989 gross national product of below $750 and small island countries with a population of 2 million or less and with a 1989 per capita gross national product between $750 and $1,500), the participation at inter-sessional meetings of the Standing Committee for Programme Matters of one official responsible for technical cooperation from the capital shall be facilitated by providing funding for travel and per diem to be financed out of the administrative budgets of the United Nations Development Programme and the United Nations Population Fund;

13. Further decides that the participation in field visits shall be facilitated by providing funding for travel and per diem out of the administrative budgets of the United Nations Development Programme and the United Nations Population Fund and at the same time invites all donor countries, as well as other countries in a position to do so, to pay for their own participation in the field visits;

Programme of work for 1991

14. Decides that the programme of work of the Standing Committee for Programme Matters for 1991 shall be decided in the course of its first meeting during the special session of the Governing Council and shall include an inter-sessional meeting in May and a first series of field visits to take place in the second half of 1991;

B

The Governing Council,

Recalling its decisions 83/5 of 24 June 1983, 85/17 of 29 June 1985, 87/20 of 19 June 1987 and 90/23 of 23 June 1990,

Having considered the oral report of the Administrator on the budgetary and financial implications of the setting up of the Standing Committee for Programme Matters,

1. Reaffirms the understanding reached in the informal consultations that all donor countries and, to the extent possible, other members of the Governing Council who participate in the field visits should pay for the costs associated with their participation;

2. Authorizes the Administrator of the United Nations Development Programme and the Executive Director of the United Nations Population Fund to make provision for 1991 in the administrative budgets of the United Nations Development Programme and the United Nations Population Fund, in the proportion

of 80 per cent and 20 per cent, respectively, for an amount of $280,000, calculated on the basis of full costing, to cover the cost to the United Nations Development Programme and the United Nations Population Fund, of two inter-sessional meetings of the Standing Committee for Programme Matters and up to four field visits of an average of six members per field visit to no more than two countries per field visit per year;

3. Requests the Administrator of the United Nations Development Programme and the Executive Director of the United Nations Population Fund to incorporate the above costs into the revised budget estimates as cost adjustments, to be presented to the Governing Council at its thirty-eighth session;

4. Authorizes the Administrator of the United Nations Development Programme and the Executive Director of the United Nations Population Fund to make appropriate provision for the biennium 1992-1993 in the administrative budgets of the United Nations Development Programme and the United Nations Population Fund, in the proportion of 80 per cent and 20 per cent, respectively, for an amount of $560,000, calculated on the basis of full costing, to cover the cost to the United Nations Development Programme and the United Nations Population Fund, of two inter-sessional meetings of the Standing Committee for Programme Matters per year, and up to four field visits of an average of six members per field visit to no more than two countries per field visit per year;

5. Requests the Administrator of the United Nations Development Programme and the Executive Director of the United Nations Population Fund to incorporate the above costs into the biennial budget estimates for 1992-1993 as cost adjustments, to be presented to the Governing Council at its thirty-eighth session;

6. Requests the Administrator of the United Nations Development Programme and the Executive Director of the United Nations Population Fund to revise, as appropriate, the budget provisions for 1992-1993, based on actual expenditure experience in 1991.

Annex II

TERMS OF REFERENCE: FIELD VISITS (UNDP/UNFPA)

1. Length of visit

The team will spend at least five working days in each country visited.

2. Focus of visit

The team shall select at least four from the following list of programme issues:

(a) National execution/national capacity-building;

(b) United Nations system coordination, including common premises;

(c) Programme approach;

(d) Communication;

(e) Importance and relevance of Governing Council decisions;

(f) Process of preparing the country programme;

(g) Technical cooperation among developing countries (TCDC);

(h) HIV/AIDS.

The team may select additional issues as appropriate. The Resident Representative shall have the opportunity to suggest additional issues.

3. Mission contacts

(a) The mission shall meet with as many of the following representatives as possible:

(i) UNDP and UNFPA field staff at all levels, including a separate meeting with the administrative officer;

(ii) United Nations agency staff;

(iii) Project directors and technical advisers;

(iv) Government ministries responsible for aid coordination, finance, and planning as well as relevant sectoral ministries;

(v) Non-governmental organizations;

(vi) Other donors (bilateral, World Bank, etc.).

Sufficient time should be provided for these meetings so as to encourage a thorough dialogue among those in attendance. Some of these meetings may be held without UNDP officials.

(b) The team shall visit at least four projects, and visits to projects outside the capital are strongly encouraged. At least two of the visits should be to UNFPA projects. The team may consider splitting up to facilitate these visits;

(c) The field visits are to be a working mission of the SCPM. Its purpose is to enhance the dialogue between individual members of the SCPM and relative UNDP/UNFPA field representatives and government officials. Courtesy and protocol visits shall be kept at a minimum.

4. Participation

(a) The selection of participants should adhere to decision 91/2. It should include up to 10 representatives of the SCPM, excluding any UNDP headquarters staff that may accompany the team;

(b) Equitable gender representation should be encouraged in the formulation of each team.

5. Selection of countries

The selection of the countries to be visited (no more than two per field visit) and the timing of the visits should be determined by the SCPM based on consultations among appropriate UNDP and government officials.

6. Communication

(a) The team shall inform the field office through UNDP headquarters, at least six weeks in advance, of the specific focus of the visit;

(b) The field office shall provide background material at least two weeks in advance of the visit. The material should consist of the country schedule for the visit, a country programme background paper (e.g. aides-mémoire, country programmes), donor profiles, a detailed list of projects to be visited, and a brief issues paper;

(c) Travel information for all the participants shall be confirmed by UNDP headquarters no later than one week prior to the departure date;

(d) UNDP headquarters shall facilitate the timely exchange of the above information between the field office and team members.

Annex III

FIELD VISITS OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE FOR PROGRAMME MATTERS

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

Countries visited - United Republic of Tanzania 8-18 January 1992
Botswana 18-25 January 1992

No.	Participants from	Name	Designation
	African States		
1.	Ghana	Mr. James O. Naadjie	Counsellor, Permanent Mission of Ghana to the United Nations
	Asia and the Pacific States		
2.	Indonesia	Mr. Qomarruzaman Sulhani	Chief, Division of Multilateral Cooperation of the National Development Planning Agency
3.	Sri Lanka	Mr. Nagoorpitchai Sikkander	First Secretary, Permanent Mission of the Democratic Socialist Republic of Sri Lanka to the United Nations
	Eastern European States		
4.	Poland	Mr. Ryszard Rysinski	Second Secretary, Permanent Mission of Poland to the United Nations
	Latin America and the Caribbean States		
5.	Saint Lucia	H.E. Dr. Charles S. Flemming	Ambassador, Permanent Mission of Saint Lucia to the United Nations
6.	Venezuela	Mr. Enrique Rondon	First Secretary, Permanent Mission of Venezuela to the United Nations

No.	Participants from	Name	Designation
	Western Europe and Other States		
7.	Netherlands	Mr. Jack Twiss-Quarles Van Ufford	Deputy Head, DMPEG, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
8.	Switzerland	Mr. Ivo Sieber	Third Secretary, Permanent Observer Mission of Switzerland to the United Nations

The SCPM team was accompanied by the following UNDP/UNFPA officials:

UNDP	Mr. Gus Edgren	Assistant Administrator and Director, Bureau for Programme Policy and Evaluation
UNFPA	Dr. Andrew Arkutu	Country Director, Tanzania

Countries visited - Sri Lanka 4-11 January 1992
Indonesia 11-18 January 1992

No.	Participants from	Name	Designation
	African States		
1.	Zaire	Mr. Lukabu Khabouji N'Zaji	Minister, Counsellor, Permanent Mission of the Republic of Zaire to the United Nations
	Asia and the Pacific States		
2.	China	Mr. Yao Wenlong	Senior Programme Officer of the Ministry of Foreign Economic Relations and Trade
	Eastern European States		
3.	Romania	Mr. Ioan Barac	Counsellor, Permanent Mission of Romania to the United Nations
	Latin America and the Caribbean States		
4.	Nicaragua	Mr. Max Stadthagen	Counsellor, Permanent Mission of Nicaragua to the United Nations
5.	Uruguay	Ms. Adriana Lissidini	First Secretary, Permanent Mission of Uruguay to the United Nations
	Western Europe and Other States		
6.	Canada	Mr. Martin Sutter	Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA)
7.	Denmark	Ms. Birte Poulsen	Head of Division, Ministry of Foreign Affairs

The SCPM team was accompanied by the following UNDP official:

	UNDP	Mr. Jean-Jacques Graisse	Director, Division of External Relations, and Secretary, UNDP Governing Council

Countries visited - Egypt 4-11 January 1992
Morocco 11-18 January 1992

No.	Participants from	Name	Designation
	African States		
1.	Algeria	Mr. Rachid Ouali	Head of UNDP Section, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
	Asia and the Pacific States		
2.	Pakistan	Ms. Tehmina Janjua	Second Secretary, Permanent Mission of Pakistan to the United Nations
	Eastern European States		
3.	Bulgaria	Mr. Svetlozar Panov	Third Secretary, Permanent Mission of Bulgaria to the United Nations
	Latin America and the Caribbean States		
4.	Cuba	Mr. Salvador Cabeiro-Quintana	Specialist, State Committee for Economic Collaboration
	Western Europe and Other States		
5.	United States of America	Ms. Margaret Pollack	Chief, Economic and Humanitarian Affairs Division, Department of State
6.	Spain	Mrs. Almundena Mazarrasa	Deputy Director-General, Institute for International Cooperation

The SCPM team was accompanied by the following UNFPA official:

UNFPA	Ms. Ellen Ranneberg-Nilsen	Country Director, Morocco

Countries visited - India 8-15 March 1992
Bhutan 15-22 March 1992

No.	Participants from	Name	Designation
	African States		
1.	Algeria	Mr. Larbi Djacta	Second Secretary, Permanent Mission of Algeria to the United Nations
2.	Mauritania	Mr. Kharass Kane	First Counsellor, Permanent Mission of the Islamic Republic of Mauritania to the United Nations
3.	Nigeria	Mr. Abdullahi L. Sidi	First Secretary, Permanent Mission of Nigeria to the United Nations
	Asia and the Pacific States		
	Nil		
	Eastern European States		
	Nil		
	Latin America and the Caribbean States		
4.	Bolivia	Mr. Luis Pablo Ossio-Bustillos	Second Secretary, Permanent Mission of Bolivia to the United Nations
5.	Guyana	Ms. June Persaud	Minister Counsellor, Permanent Mission of Guyana to the United Nations
	Western Europe and Other States		
6.	Denmark	Mr. Ulrich Sorensen	First Secretary, Permanent Mission of Denmark to the United Nations

No.	Participants from	Name	Designation
	Western Europe and Other States (continued)		
7.	Netherlands	Mr. Kees P. Rade	First Secretary, Permanent Mission of the Netherlands to the United Nations
8.	Norway	Ms. Ola Brevik	Second Secretary, Permanent Mission of Norway to the United Nations
9.	Switzerland	Ms. Nicole Wyrsch	Desk Officer, Multilateral Development Affairs, SDC

The SCPM team was accompanied by the following UNDP official:

	UNDP	Mr. Filip Marusic	Principal Officer, Policy Division, Bureau for Programme Policy and Evaluation

	Countries visited - Syrian Arab Republic Yemen		31 August-6 September 1992 7-13 September 1992
No.	Participants from	Name	Designation
	African States		
1.	Ghana	Mr. Simon Nyamikeh	First Secretary, Permanent Mission of Ghana to the United Nations
2.	Nigeria	Mr. K. O. Olisemeka	Minister, Permanent Mission of Nigeria to the United Nations
	Asia and the Pacific States		
	Nil		
	Eastern European States		
3.	Poland	Mr. Wojciech Ponikiewski	Third Secretary, Permanent Mission of the Republic of Poland to the United Nations
4.	Romania	Mr. Gheorghe Vlad	First Secretary, Department of International Organizations, Section of Technical Cooperation, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
	Latin America and the Caribbean States		
5.	Cuba	Mr. Salvador Cabeiro-Quintana	Specialist of the State Committee for Economic Collaboration
6.	Saint Lucia	Mr. Peter Lansiquot	Economist, Ministry of Planning and Personnel
7.	Austria	Mr. Thomas Stelzer	Counsellor, Permanent Mission of Austria to the United Nations
8.	Germany	Mr. Christian Neumann	Deputy Head of Division, Ministry for Economic Cooperation

Countries visited - Bolivia — 31 August-6 September 1992
Paraguay — 7-13 September 1992

No.	Participants from	Name	Designation
	African States		
	Nil		
	Asia and the Pacific States		
	Nil		
	Eastern European States		
1.	Russian Federation	Mr. Yuriy N. Isakov	Senior Counsellor, Permanent Mission of the Russian Federation to the United Nations
	Latin America and the Caribbean States		
2.	Nicaragua	Mr. Max Stadthagen	Counsellor, Permanent Mission of Nicaragua to the United Nations
3.	Uruguay	Mr. William Ehlers	First Secretary, Permanent Mission of Uruguay to the United Nations
	Western Europe and Other States		
4.	France	Mr. Thierry Borja de Mozota	Direction des Nations Unies et Organisations internationales, Ministère des Affaires Etrangères
5.	Italy	Mr. Massimo Amadio	Technical Adviser, Development Cooperation, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
6.	United Kingdom	Mr. Peter Twite	Second Secretary, United Nations Commonwealth Department, Overseas Development Administration

---